

## **REMARKS**

Prior to this Reply, Claims 1-24 were pending. Through this Reply, Claims 7-14 and 24 have been amended, while Claims 25-30 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-6, 15-23 and 25-30 are now at issue in the present case.

### **I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note, with thanks, the Examiner's indication of the allowability of Claims 1-6 and 14-23.

Applicants have not amended Claims 1-6 and 15-23. Accordingly, Applicants believe that such claims are still allowable.

Applicants have cancelled Claim 14 and have included new Claim 25, which is similar to allowed Claim 14. New Claims 26-30 depend from new Claim 25.

### **II. Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a). The Examiner noted that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the shield associated with the write device set forth in Claims 7-13 and 24 must be shown or the feature must be cancelled from the claims.

In response, Applicants have cancelled Claims 7-13 and 24. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

### **III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected Claims 7-13 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner found that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, as the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, the Examiner noted that Claim 7 sets forth “a shield associated with said write device”; however, outside of Claim 7, there is no discussion or depiction in the disclosure of such an embodiment and the mere broad mention of such a structure in Claim 7 is not considered adequate to provide enablement.

In response, in order to expedite allowance of the application and without necessarily agreeing with the Examiner’s position, Applicants have cancelled Claims 7-13 and 24. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is now moot.

### **IV. Additional Claim Fees**

In determining whether additional claim fees are due, reference is made to the Fee Calculation Table (below).

**Fee Calculation Table**

	Claims Remaining After Amendment		Highest Number Previously Paid For	Present Extra	Rate	Additional Fee
Total (37 CFR 1.16(c))	21	Minus	24	= 0	x \$50 =	\$ 0.00
Independent (37 CFR 1.16(b))	4	Minus	5	= 0	x \$200 =	\$ 0.00

As set forth in the Fee Calculation Table (above), Applicants previously paid claim fees for twenty-four (24) total claims and for five (5) independent claims. Therefore, Applicants

believe that no additional claim fees are due. Nevertheless, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2198 for any fee deficiencies associated with filing this paper.

**V. Conclusion**

It is believed the above comments establish patentability. Applicants do not necessarily accede to the assertions and statements in the Office Action, whether or not expressly addressed.

Applicants believe that the application appears to be in form for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number regarding any matters relating to the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Tejpal S. Hansra  
Registration No. 38,172  
Hansra Patent Services  
4525 Glen Meadows Place  
Bellingham, WA 98226  
(360) 527-1400

Date: August 29, 2005